

REMARKS

The present application was filed on November 26, 2003 with claims 1 through 25. Claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16- 25 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 4-6, 13, 16-18 and 25 are proposed to be amended.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 6, 16, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 8, 13, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan et al. (United States Patent Number 5,394,471) in view of Ogura et al. (United States Patent Publication Number 2004/0078603) and in view of Li et al. (United States Patent Number 7,231,381). Claims 2, 7, 11, 14, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan et al. in view of Ogura, in view of Li and in view of Honarvar et al. (United States Patent Number 7,231,657). Claims 4-6 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan et al., in view of Ogura, in view of Li and in view of P-Synch Installation and Configuration Guide (May 2002). Claims 9, 10, 12, 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan et al., in view of Ogura, in view of Li and in view of Kanevsky et al. (United States Patent Number 5,774,525).

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 4, 5, 6, 16, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicates that Claims 4-6 and 16-18 recite the limitations "said correlation rules" or "said one or more predefined correlation rules," and lack proper antecedent basis. Claims 4-6 and 16-18 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the section 112 rejections.

Independent Claims

Claims 1, 13 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan et al. in view of Ogura et al. and further in view of Li et al.

The Examiner asserts that Li et al. teaches performing an Internet "search using a query containing one or more keywords derived from said proposed password

(from inputted personal/desired details/information)” *Citing* Figs. 1 and 2, and col. 8, lines 37-67, col. 9, lines 1-9.

Li et al., however, do not disclose or suggest performing an Internet search using a query containing one or more keywords *derived from said proposed password*. Rather, Li et al. describe an image retrieval process whereby images are retrieved based on “a textual description of the desired images” Col. 8, lines 45-47. There is no disclosure or suggestion of performing an Internet search based on a password (proposed or otherwise). The only reference in Li et al. to a “password” is believed to appear in col. 3, lines 31-32, and this passage merely describes accessing images that are password-protected.

In addition, contrary to the Examiner’s suggestion, Li et al. do not disclose or suggest performing an Internet “search using a query containing one or more keywords derived from said proposed password (from inputted personal/desired details/information).” *Citing* Figs. 1 and 2, and col. 8, lines 37-67, col. 9, lines 1-9. There is no suggestion in Li et al. of inputting personal information.

Finally, each independent claim has been further amended to emphasize that the Internet search is performed using a query containing one or more keywords derived from the *personal details* of the proposed password. As already indicated, Li et al. do not disclose or suggest performing an Internet search based on a proposed password, or on the personal details of a proposed password.

No Motivation to Combine

The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ogura with Ganesan, since one would have been motivated to reset (re-generate/reinitialize) the user password (PIN) based on secondary authentication system and protect the data within the device [paragraph 0005, 0006]. Applicants submit, however, that this asserted motivation does not suggest a system for receiving one or more personal details from a user that is related to a selected topic as a proposed password, and performing an Internet search using the personal details of the proposed password to determine if the proposed password is correlated with the user.

Furthermore, the Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to a persona of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Li with Ganesan and Ogura, since one would have been motivated to retrieve the information from the large and dynamic database effectively [Li, col. 1 lines 16-19]. Applicants submit, however, that this asserted motivation does not suggest a system for receiving one or more personal details from a user that is related to a topic, as a proposed password, and performing an Internet search using the personal details of the proposed password to determine if the proposed password is correlated with the user.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 13 and 25.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2, 4-12, 14 and 16-24 are dependent on independent claims 1 and 13, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Ganesan et al., Ogura et al., Li et al., Honarvar et al., P-Synch Installation and Configuration Guide and Kanevsky et al., because of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 13 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim

Conclusion

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments, i.e., claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16- 25, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin M. Mason/

Date: April 16, 2008

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560